arXiv:math/0511364v3 [math.AG] 30 Mar 2006

CLEMENS'S CONJECTURE: PART II

Bin Wang
Oct, 2005

Dept of Math., University of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309-0426
Emil: wangb@euclid.colorado.edu

Abstract. This is the part II of our series of two papers, "Clemens conjecture: part I", "Clemens conjecture: part II". Continuing from part I, in this paper we turn our attention to general quintic threefolds. In some universal quintic threefold X, we construct a family of quasi-regular deformations B_b such that the generic member in this family is non-deviated, but some special member is deviated. By the result from part I, this is impossible unless there is no one parameter family of smooth rational curves in a generic quintic threefold.

1. Main result and review of part I

In this paper which is the continuation of [Wa], we study the deformations of rational curves in quintic threefolds. The main goal is to introduce new geometric objects associated to the family of rational curves in quintic threefolds: degenerated locus I_r (definition (**2.2**)), spaces of morphisms with marked points $\Sigma_{n(t)}$, $\Sigma_{m(t)}$ (after definition (**2.1**)). Using those basic objects, we construct the family of surfaces B_b and finally prove Clemens's conjecture:

Theorem 1.1. *For each $d > 0$, there is no one parameter family c_f^s(for a small complex number s) of smooth rational curves of degree d in a generic quintic threefold f.*

The proof is based on a construction of a family of quasi-deformations B_b of the rational curve c_f^0 in f that has both deviated and non-deviated members. Because in [Wa], we have proved such a family $\{B_b\}$ is an obstruction to the existence of a deformation of c_f^0 in f. So the only goal in this paper is to construct such a family $\{B_b\}$ that satisfies all requirements in part I, definitions (**1.2**) and (**1.5**).

Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0070409

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

For reader's convenience, in the following we briefly review those definitions and a theorem about them.

The following is the set-up. Let X be a smooth variety. Let Δ be an open set of $\mathbb{C}$ that contains 0. Let π be a smooth morphism

$$X \xrightarrow{\pi} \Delta$$

such that for each $\epsilon \in \Delta$, $\pi^{-1}(\epsilon)$, denoted by f_ϵ, is a smooth Calabi-Yau threefold, i.e. $c_1(T(f_\epsilon)) = 0$. Assume there is a surface $C \subset X$ such that the restriction map

$$C \xrightarrow{\pi_C} \Delta$$

is also smooth and for each ϵ, $(\pi_C)^{-1}(\epsilon)$, denoted by c_ϵ, is a smooth rational curve. Furthermore we assume the normal bundle of c_ϵ in f_ϵ has the following splitting

$$N_{c_\epsilon}(f_\epsilon) = \mathcal{O}_{c_\epsilon}(k) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{c_\epsilon}(-2-k),$$

where $k \geq 0$. Hence $N_C(X)|_{c_\epsilon}$ is also equal to

$$\mathcal{O}_{c_\epsilon}(k) \oplus \mathcal{O}_{c_\epsilon}(-2-k). \tag{1.2}$$

Assume that there exists a deformation c_ϵ^s of c_ϵ in each f_ϵ with $c_\epsilon^0 = c_\epsilon$. Recall that $R \subset \Delta^2 \times X$ is the universal curves of the c_ϵ^s. So we have correspondence

$$\begin{tikzcd} R \arrow[r, "\pi_2"] \arrow[d, "\pi_1"'] & X \\ \Delta^2. & \end{tikzcd}$$

Clemens's conjecture is equivalent to the non-existence of such a correspondence R in case where each f_ϵ is a generic quintic threefold.

Let $S = \cup_{\epsilon,s} c_\epsilon^s$ be the total set of the two parameter family of rational curves, restricted to a tubular neighborhood of c_0. Let H be a generic divisor of X such that in a tubular neighborhood of c_0, $H \cap S$ is the surface C at generic points of c_0. Let $q_1, \cdots, q_k$ be the points on c_0 such that $\pi_{2*}((\frac{\partial}{\partial s}, 0))$(which is a section of the sub-bundle of $T_{c_0}X$ that corresponds to $\mathcal{O}_{c_0}(k)$ portion in (1.2)) at these points, lies in TC.

In the following we give a definition of a family $\{B_b\}$ of quasi-regular deformations of c_0.

Definition 1.3.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a quasi-projective variety. Let

$$\begin{tikzcd} B \arrow[r, "\subset"] \arrow[d] & X \times \mathcal{B} \\ \mathcal{B} & \end{tikzcd}$$

be a family of surfaces restricted to a tubular neighborhood of c_0 in X. Each fibre in X over $b \in \mathcal{B}$ will be denote by B_b. A fibre B_b is called a quasi-regular deformation of c_0 with order $(2,3)$ if the restriction of B_b to a tubular neighborhood of c_0 in X contains c_0 and satisfies the following conditions:

(1)Let $(B_b)_s$ be the smooth locus of B_b. We require scheme-theoretically,

$$(B_b)_s \cap f_0 = (B_b)_s \cap c_0,$$

i.e., the intersection $(B_b)_s \cap f_0$ in a neighborhood of a smooth point of B_b is just c_0. Also we let $t_h, h = 1, \cdots, j_1 + j_2$ be all the fixed points on c_0 such that the intersection scheme $(B_b)_s \cap H$ is equal to

$$(B_b)_s \cap H = V_0 \cup \{V_1 \cup \cdots V_{j_1}\} \cup \{V_{j_1+1} \cup \cdots V_{j_1+j_2}\} \cup \cdots$$

where V_0 is the component c_0 with geometric multiplicity 2; the other components, $V_h, h = 1, \cdots, j_1 + j_2$, are smooth curves in a tubular neighborhood of c_0 and transversal to c_0 at the points t_h in the surface B_b where $H \cap S = C$. All the components expressed as the dots in (1.3) meet c_0 at the points that varies with H.

Similarly, the intersection scheme $(B_b)_s \cap S$ is equal to

$$(B_b)_s \cap S = U_0 \cup \{U_1 \cup \cdots U_{i_1}\} \cup \{U_{i_1+1} \cup \cdots U_{i_1+i_2}\} \cup \{U_{i_1+i_2+1} \cup \cdots U_{i_1+i_2+k}\}$$

where U_0 is the component c_0 with geometric multiplicity 3; all the other components $U_h, h = 1, \cdots, i_1 + i_2$, are smooth curves in a tubular neighborhood of c_0 and transversal to c_0 in the surface B_b and $U_h, h > i_1 + i_2$ is singular and meets c_0 at $q_{h-(i_1+i_2)}$. Assume $i_1 = j_1$ and $V_h = U_h, 0 < h \leqq i_1$. For the simplicity also assume $V_h, V_{h'}$ for $0 < h \neq h' \leqq i_1$ meets c_0 at distinct points. Since H is generic this just says all curves from the set

$$\{V_1, \cdots, V_{j_1}\} = \{U_1, \cdots, U_{i_1}\}$$

lie in C. We require all the numbers i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 to be independent of the parameter b.

(2) (Singularity Control) Let $t=0$ *on* c_0 *be any singular point of* B_b*. Assume it is a smooth point of* S*. There are local coordinates of* X*,* $(t,\theta_0,\theta_1,\theta_2)$ *at this point, such that* $c_0=(t,0,0,0), t\in\mathbb{C}P^1$*,* $\theta_2=0$*, defines the divisor* S*; and* $\theta_1=\theta_2=0$ *define the surface* $C=\cup_\delta c_\delta$*. Then* B_b *locally is the proper projection of* $\tilde{B}_b\subset\mathbb{C}\times X$ *to* X *in a neighborhood of* $(0,0)\in\tilde{B}_b$*. If* y *is the variable for* $\mathbb{C}$*, then a neighborhood of* $\tilde{B}_b$ *at the point* $(0,0)$ *can be defined by equations*

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta_0^2+y(a_1t+a_2\theta_0+a_3y)=0,\\ &\theta_1=y\big(a_4t^m+a_5\theta_0+a_6y\big),\\ &\theta_2=y\big(a_7\theta_0t^m+a_8t^my+a_9y\theta_0+a_{10}y^2\big).\end{aligned}\tag{1.4}$$

where a_i *are* **non vanishing polynomials** *at the origin, and* $m=0$*,or* 1*. Let's call the number* m*, the* m*-index associated to this singularity. Let* n_0 *be the number of the singularities with* $m=0$ *and* n_1 *the number of singular point of* B_b *of* $m=1$*. We require* $n_1=1$ *and* n_0 *is independent of* b*.*

(3) At the point $q_i, i=1,\cdots,k$*, we set up a similar coordinate system* $(t,\theta_0,\theta_1,\theta_2)$ *such that* q_i *is the origin, the equations* $\theta_i=0, i=0,1,2$ *define* c_0*, the equation* $\theta_1=\theta_2=0$ *define* C*, and* $\frac{\partial}{\partial t},\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_0},\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_1}$ *span the subbundle* E *along* c_0*.*

The defining equations of B_b *are*

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_0^2b_1&=\theta_1\\ \theta_0^3b_2&=\theta_2,\end{aligned}$$

where all b_i *are non-vanishing polynomials at the origin. Note that the change of coordinates* θ_i *only changes the the higher orders of* b_i*.*

Remark. In part (1), the intersection $(B_b)_s\cap H$ could have more components expressed in the dots, because in general, C may not be a hyperplane section of B_b. So these components come from the points on c_0 where $B_b\cap H\neq C$ for a specific H. From another point of view, these crossing points $t_h, 1\leqq h\leqq j_1+j_2$, in the intersection $B_b\cap H$ from part (1), are all imbedded points in the scheme of the excess intersection $(B_b)_s\cap C$.

The contribution to the $I(b)$ from the singularity requires a specific description of the singularity. Analyzing the singularity, especially when $m=1$ is a subtle process. The entire proof of Clemens conjecture comes down to the calculation of some lengths of modules of local rings at this singular point.

We are only interested in a special kind of quasi-regular deformations B_b. Those coefficients a_i at a singularity of $m=1$ satisfy some algebraic equations. Because these equations are rather long, we'll use a more algebraic description of a source of these equations. The following is the definition of a deviated B_b versus a non-deviated B_b.

Definition 1.5 (Deviated and Non-deviated). *Let the following polynomials a_i be the coefficients of B_b at the singular point p_0 of B_b with $m = 1$, and we may assume $a_6 = a_7 = 1$ for convenience. We define*

$$a_5' = a_5 + a_1 t + a_2\theta_0 + a_3 y.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} l_1(t,\theta_0,y) &= -(a_4 t + a_5'\theta_0), \\ l_2(t,\theta_0,y) &= (a_8 - a_{10}a_4)t + (a_9 - a_{10}a_5')\theta_0, \\ l_3(t,\theta_0,y) &= (a_1 - a_3 a_4)t + (a_2 - a_3 a_5')\theta_0, \end{aligned}$$

and let

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 &= \theta_0 t + l_1 l_2, \\ g_2 &= \theta_0^2 + l_1 l_3, \\ g_3 &= t l_3 - \theta_0 l_2, \\ g_4 &= y - l_1. \end{aligned}$$

Next let $\mathcal{R}_2^b$ be the scheme defined by g_1, g_2, g_4 and $\mathcal{R}_1^b$ be defined by g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4. Thus $\mathcal{R}_1^b \subset \mathcal{R}_2^b$.

(a) The B_b (and the singular point p_0) is called **deviated** *if at the singular point of $m = 1$, there is a linear change of coordinates*

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_0' &= \theta_0'(t,\theta_0) \\ t' &= t'(t,\theta_0), \end{aligned}$$

and u_1, u_2, u_3 which do not vanish at p_0, $u_2^2 + u_1 \neq 0$ at p_0, such that $\mathcal{R}_1^b$ is defined by

$$(\theta_0')^2 + u_1(t')^4 = \theta_0' t' + u_2(t')^3 = u_3(t')^3 = g_4 = 0,$$

and $\mathcal{R}_2^b$ is defined by

$$(\theta_0')^2 + u_1(t')^4 = \theta_0' t' + u_2(t')^3 = g_4 = 0.$$

(b) The fibre B_b (and the singular point p_0) is called **non-deviated** *if at the singular point of $m = 1$, the homogeneous portions $(g_i)_2, i = 1,2,3$ of degree 2, of the non-homogeneous polynomials $g_i, i = 1,2,3$ have distinct roots.*

(c) Let

$$L(b) = L(\mathcal{O}_{O,\mathcal{R}_2^b}) - L(\mathcal{O}_{O,\mathcal{R}_1^b})$$

be the multiplicity of the pair of local rings $\mathcal{O}_{O,\mathcal{R}_1^b}, \mathcal{O}_{O,\mathcal{R}_2^b}$.

In [Wa] we proved:

Theorem 1.6. *With the notations and assumptions are as above, if a generic fibre B_b is non-deviated, but some special fibre is deviated, then c_ϵ can't deform in f_ϵ.*

Thus it is clear that in this paper, we only need to search for a one parameter family of quintic threefolds in all quintic threefolds, in which we construct a deviated quasi-regular deformation B_b. Then by theorem (**1.6**), theorem (**1.1**) is proved. In logic, it is important to notice all of the constructions here in this paper is independent of the existence of a deformation of rational curves in generic quintic threefolds, i.e., we don't need the assumption (**2.1**) below. But we state it in the next section in order to verify the conditions on B_b, not for the construction itself. Thus the local multiplicity $I(b, p_i)$ also can be calculated without the existence of R. Then we can say the sum of $I(b, p_i)$ being zero is an obstruction to the existence of R. The following is how we organize the rest of the paper: In section (**2**), we state the construction of family $\{B_b\}$ and sufficient geometric conditions (2.5), (2.10) for the construction of B_b which would allow the family $\{B_b\}$ to have a deviated member. There will be no proofs, only statements of the construction in this section. In section (**3**), we prove that these conditions (2.5), (2.10) are sufficient for a quasi-regular deformation. The main point of the proof is to show that all the indices i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2, n_0 are independent of the parameter b. They are all zeros of sections of some vector bundles over the rational curve c_0. In section **4**, we prove that the conditions (2.5), (2.10) can be achieved in generic quintic threefolds and some special member B_b is deviated.

Acknowledgment: We would like to thank Herb Clemens for all the advises and stimulating discussions on this subject during this work.

2. The geometric requirements for a quasi-regular deformation B_b

First let's start with our setting. Let $\mathbb{C}P^{125}$ be the projectivization of

$$H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^4}(5)),$$

the space of all hypersurfaces of degree 5 in $\mathbb{C}P^4$. let M be the space of all morphisms

$$c : \mathbb{C}P^1 \to \mathbb{C}P^4$$

whose image is an irreducible, smooth rational curve of degree d. Thus M is an open set of projectivization of $H^0(\oplus_5 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d))$.

The following assumption is not used in the construction of B_b, rather in the verification that our constructed B_b is a family of quasi-regular deformations with a deviated member.

Assumption 2.1. *Through out this paper, we assume a one parameter family*

$$c_f^\epsilon, \epsilon \text{ small complex number}$$

of smooth rational curves of degree d *in a generic quintic three fold* f *exists and its normal bundle*

$$N_{c_f^\epsilon}(f)$$

is equal to

$$O_{c_f^\epsilon}(k) \oplus O_{c_f^\epsilon}(-2-k)$$

for all ϵ.

Let

$$S = \{(f, x) \in \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4 : x \in c_f^\epsilon,\ for\ small\ \epsilon\}$$

be the total set of family c_f^ϵ for small ϵ.

Let e be the evaluation map

$$\begin{array}{ccc} e : \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M \times \mathbb{C}P^1 & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4 \\ ([f], [c], t) & \longrightarrow & ([f], c(t)). \end{array}$$

Let

$$\Gamma = \{([f], [c]) \in \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M : c \subset f\}$$

be an irreducible component of the incidence scheme, Γ_{Re} be the reduced variety of Γ. Suppose the family c_f^ϵ in assumption (**2.1**) lies in Γ_{Re}, i.e., $(f, c_f^\epsilon) \in \Gamma_{Re}$. So assumption (**2.1**) says Γ dominates $\mathbb{C}P^{125}$ and $\dim(\Gamma)$ is larger than 125. The following are very important conventions we'll use through out the paper:

(1) Since our study is locally around a generic point γ_0 of Γ_{Re} , we choose an affine open set $\mathbb{C}^{129+5d}$ of $\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M$, denoted by U. Later all the necessary structures we use are the canonical structure of this linear space $\mathbb{C}^{129+5d}$: these structures include the linear space , flat connection.

(2) We let U be identified with a closed set in

$$H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^4}(5)) \times H^0(\oplus_5 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d)),$$

that does not contain the origin. Also $U = U_1 \times U_2$, where $U_1 = \mathbb{C}^{125}$ is a closed set in $H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^4}(5))$ and $U_2 = \mathbb{C}^{5d+4}$ is a closed set of $H^0(\oplus_5 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d))$.

(3) If $\gamma = ([f], [c]) \in \Gamma_{Re}$, then $\gamma(t)$ denotes $([f], c(t))$.

(4) If $\alpha \in T_\gamma U$, then $\alpha(t)$ is the vector field $e_*(\alpha)$ at the points $\gamma(t)$.

(5) We denote the directional derivative by F_v for a function F and a tangent vector v.

(6) All the higher derivatives in $\mathbb{C}P^4$ are done in homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{C}P^4$. For instance if α_1, α_2 are two vectors at a point $[z] \in \mathbb{C}P^4$. for a homogeneous polynomial F on $\mathbb{C}P^4$, $F_{\alpha_1\alpha_2}([z])$ is the second derivatives in homogeneous coordinates in the direction of $\tilde{\alpha}_i$, where $\tilde{\alpha}_i$ are the non-zero vectors in $\mathbb{C}^5$ at z that corresponds to α_i.

After the introductions of all the notations, let's come back to the construction of B_b. For that, we would like to choose a curve $L \in \mathbb{C}P^{125}$, and construct a quasi-regular deformation $B_b \subset L \times \mathbb{C}P^4$. The construction begin with some subvariety $\Sigma_{m(t)}$ in $L \times M$. Then through the evaluation map e, it is "transformed" to the space $L \times \mathbb{C}P^4$.

Let $f \in U_1$, $c \in U_2$. Its pull-back $c^*(f)$ is a section of $O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d)$ bundle. Let $(f_0, c_0) \in \Gamma_{Re}$. So $c_0^*(f_0) = 0$. Let $\alpha \in T_{(f_0,c_0)}(U)$. If we view $c^*(f)$ as a map from the closed set U of

$$H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^4}(5)) \oplus H^0(\oplus_5 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d))$$

to $H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d))$. Then the derivative $(c^*f)_\alpha$ lies in the tangent space $T_0(H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d)))$ of linear space $H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d))$ at 0. We identify $T_0(H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d)))$ with $H^0(O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d))$. Thus $(c^*f)_\alpha$ is again a section of $O_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d)$.

Definition 2.2. *(Degenerated Locus) Let*

$$I_r \subset sym^{5d-r}(\mathbb{C}P^1) \times \Gamma_{Re}$$

be the set of all $(m(t), ([f_0], [c_0]))$ that satisfy: for each $h(t) \in sym^r(\mathbb{C}P^1)$, there is a first order deformation $\alpha_{h(t)} \in T_{([f_0],[c_0])}(U)$ of f_0, c_0 in $\mathbb{C}P^{125}$ and M, such that the divisor of the section $(c^*f)_\alpha$ on $\mathbb{C}P^1$ is $h(t) + m(t)$. Here we abused the notation: $h(t) + m(t)$ means the sum of all points in $h(t)$ and $m(t)$. That says that α moves $5d$ points $h(t), m(t)$ within the universal quintic threefold X.

(1) We call I_r the degenerated locus of length r. From now on if $(m(t), \gamma)$ is in the degenerated locus, we say $m(t) \in sym^{5d-r}(\mathbb{C}P^1)$ is degenerated relative to $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$(or γ is degenerated relative to $m(t)$).

(2) We let $\Omega_{m(t)}$ be the fibre of I_r over a point $m(t) \in sym^{5d-r}(\mathbb{C}P^1)$. So $\Omega_{m(t)}$ is the collection of all $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$ such that γ is degenerated relative to $m(t)$.

Let $t_i, i = 1, \cdots, 5d-r$ be the points from $m(t)$, and

$$J = \frac{\partial(c^*f(t_1), \cdots, c^*f(t_{5d-r}))}{\partial(y_1, \cdots, y_{129+5d})}$$

be the Jacobian matrix at $(f, c) = \gamma \in \Gamma$, where y_i are the variables for U. Then I_r is exactly the determinantal variety of J whose maximal rank is $5d - r - 1$.

Remark. A necessary condition for $L(b)$ to be a non-constant is that the intersection of $\mathcal{A} \cap B_b$ is non-proper, or equivalently B_b contains the rational curve $\bar{c}_0$. That requires at least one of the intersection points of $f \cap c$ for $(f, c) \in B_b$ sweeps through the entire curve c_0 as (f, c) approaches $(f_0, c_0) \in \Gamma_{Re}$. The degenerated locus is the exact notion for study of this limiting process.

Now let $\gamma_0 = (f_0, c_0)$ be a generic point in Γ_{Re}. Let $m(t)$ be degenerated relative to γ_0 of length r. The following are all the geometric objects we need for the construction of B_b:

(1) Pick a point 0 in $m(t)$. Let $n(t) = m(t) - 0 \in sym^{5d-r-1}(\mathbb{C}P^1)$ such that $n(t)$ is not degenerated relative to all γ near γ_0 (including γ_0). Consider the subset

$$\Sigma'_{m(t)} = \{([f], [c]) \in U : div(c^* f) = m(t) + r \ points\}.$$

$$\Sigma'_{n(t)} = \{([f], [c]) \in U : div(c^* f) = n(t) + (r+1) \ points\}.$$

So $\Sigma'_{m(t)}$(or $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$) over each quintic f is the collection of all morphisms:

$$\mathbb{C}P^1 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}P^4$$

that send the marked points $m(t)$ (or $n(t)$) to the quintic f. Note $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ is smooth at γ_0, but $\Sigma'_{m(t)}$ is not.

(2) Let l be a curve in Γ_{Re}, which will be called the central axis. The projection of l to $\mathbb{C}P^{125}$ is a smooth curve through the point γ_0, denoted by L.

(3) Let $\mathcal{S}_1$ be some codimensional $128 + r - dim(\Gamma)$ subvariety of U that contains Γ_{Re} and is smooth along Γ_{Re}. Let $\mathcal{S}_2$ be a smooth subvariety of U of codimension dimΓ-1, such that scheme-theoretically $\mathcal{S}_2 \cap \Gamma_{Re} = l$(intersection is proper).

(4) Let

$$\Sigma_{m(t)} = \Sigma'_{m(t)} \cap \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_2$$

$$\Sigma_{n(t)} = \Sigma'_{n(t)} \cap \mathcal{S}_1 \cap \mathcal{S}_2.$$

(5) Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the collection of all pairs of subvarieties $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$ which is an open set of the product of the Chow variety.

Definition 2.3.

The surface B_b is defined to be the non trivial component (not equal to $e(l \times \mathbb{C}P^1)$ and $e(\Sigma_m \times \{t_i\})$ where t_i is one of the point of $m(t)$.) of the intersection

$$e(\Sigma_{m(t)} \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap X. \tag{2.4}$$

Remark. It is not difficult to see the intersection $e(\Sigma_{m(t)} \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap X$ always has the trivial component

$$e(l \times \mathbb{C}P^1)$$

which is the union rational curves from Γ_{Re} and $5d-r$ components

$$e(\Sigma_m \times \{t_i\})$$

that do not contain c_0 but meet c_0 at $c_0(t_i)$ for all t_i from $m(t)$. Our B_b is residual to these trivial components. This process of taking the residue is a very important step to obtain the deviated singular point p_0. Thus all the procedures of taking marked points, intersections by $\mathcal{S}_i$ and the residue are for one purpose: to produce a deviated singular point of B_b which is equivalent to have a non-constant $L(b)$.

During the construction we should note B_b depends on Σ'_m, thus Σ'_n, l and the cutting varieties $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$. There are two different levels of that dependence: $\Sigma'_{m(t)}, \Sigma'_{m(t)}$ determine the component $\mathcal{B}$ in the Chow variety; the cutting by $\mathcal{S}_i$ determines a specific B_b in the component $\mathcal{B}$. Definition (**2.3**) is the basic construction of the family of surface $\{B_b\}$. In general a component $\mathcal{B}$ in (2.3) is a quasi-regular deformation, but it may not have a deviated member. For instance if $r < k+2$, the family $\{B_b\}$ does not have a deviated member. Thus we need to impose sufficient conditions on this family to have a deviated quasi-regular deformation as in (1.5), i.e., we need to pick a right component $\mathcal{B}$.

The following are the conditions we impose on $\Sigma_{m(t)}$ and $\Sigma_{n(t)}$. Let

$$X = \{(f, x) : f \in L, x \in f\} \subset \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4.$$

Let C be the union of all the rational curves in X, that are parametrized by the central axis l. Let H be the generic divisor of X that is generically smooth at C, and $H \cap S = C$ holds at the generic points of C. Let K be a generic divisor of X that is smooth at the generic points of c_0 (recall that c_0 is a generic curve in l), such that $K \cap H \cap S = c_0$ at generic points of c_0. The purpose of having these divisors is to give local coordinates of X at the generic points of c_0. These coordinates will be used in the defining equations of B_b.

The following are two important notations:

(1) Let $\bar{\gamma}_0$ be the rational curve $\{\gamma_0\} \times \mathbb{C}P^1$. Thus $e(\bar{\gamma}_0) = \bar{c}_0$. The notation $(\bar{\gamma}_0)^g$ denotes a scheme of geometric multiplicity g with the set $\bar{\gamma}_0$. For $g = 0$, $(\bar{\gamma}_0)^0$ denotes a scheme whose reduced variety consists of finitely many points on $\bar{\gamma}_0$.

(2) For the simplicity of the statements, $(D_1 \cap D_2)_0$ denotes the non-trivial components of the intersection $D_1 \cap D_2$ in $U \times \mathbb{C}P^1$ that are not in $\Gamma_{Re} \times \mathbb{C}P^1$, and the projection of which to $\mathbb{C}P^1$ is not any of the sets $\{t_i\}, i = 1, \cdots 5d-r$ with $(t_1, \cdots, t_{5d-r}) = m(t)$.

2.5 Primary Conditions on the $\Sigma_{m(t)}$.

These are the most important requirements on the spaces Σ_n, Σ_m, which determine the component $\mathcal{B}$. We require

$$r = k + 3. \tag{2.6}$$

and at the generic points of $\bar{\gamma}_0$,

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(H))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H) = (\bar{\gamma}_0)^0, \tag{2.7}$$

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H) = \bar{\gamma}_0, \tag{2.8}$$

$$((\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H) = (\bar{\gamma}_0)^2. \tag{2.9}$$

Remark. Actually the condition $r = k + 3$ is a necessary condition to have the following three conditions (2.7)-(2.9). The orders of contacts of three intersections along $\bar{\gamma}_0$ in (2.7), (2.8), (2.9) are strictly increasing. This is the main character for the space $\Sigma_{n(t)}$. If in any of the steps from (2.7) to (2.9), the order of the contact is not increasing (stays the same) it'll always lead to a non-deviated B_b, because of the exponent condition in (2.13), part I. The requirement for the increase of the order from (2.8) to (2.9) is that the length of the degeneracy of $m(t)$ is at least $k+2$. Here we take the length to be $k+3$ because of the secondary condition (2.12) below. These three conditions on the contacts build a foundation for a deviated B_b. These three conditions can't be obtained by adjusting the cutting angles of $\mathcal{S}_i$ because they are the conditions imposed on the entire rational curve c_0.

2.10 Secondary conditions on $\Sigma_{m(t)}$.

These requirements are secondary because they can be obtained by adjusting the cutting spaces $\mathcal{S}_i$. *These conditions will shrink the component* $\mathcal{B}$ *we already had above in (2.5). If the intersection in (2.7), (2.8), (2.9) is* $(\bar{\gamma}_0)^g$, *then through some points on* $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *the intersections (2.7), (2.8), (2.9) contain smooth curves. The following are the requirements on these curves. Let* K' *be a generic divisor in* $U \times \mathbb{C}P^1$ *such that locally* $K' \cap l = [c_0]$, *and* $e(K') = K$. *We require that:*

(a) There is only one singular point p_0 *of* B_b *such that:*

(1) there is a smooth curve as a component of the intersection

$$((\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X))_0 \cap K', \tag{2.11}$$

that passes through $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *at the point* (γ_0, p_0) *transversally in the smooth surface*

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap K';$$

(2) there is a smooth curve as a component of the intersection

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H), \tag{2.12}$$

that passes through $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *at the point* (γ_0, p_0) *transversally in the smooth surface*

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(H);$$

(3) there is a smooth curve as a component of the intersection

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}X \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap K', \tag{2.13}$$

that passes through $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *at the point* (γ_0, p_0) *transversally in*

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap K'.$$

(4) there is a smooth surface as a component of the intersection

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(H), \tag{2.14}$$

that passes through $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *at the point* (γ_0, p_0) *transversally in threefold*

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X).$$

We'll say that such a singular point of B_b *satisfying (1)-(4) has index* $m = 1$*.*

(b) at the other singular points of B_b *along* c_0*, the intersections in (2.11) is the same as above, but the intersections in (2.12) through (2.14) have only one component* $\bar{\gamma}_0$ *with multiplicities as in (2.5), i.e., they don't have a component of smooth curves passing through* $\bar{\gamma}_0$*.*

We'll let $\mathcal{B}$ be all such $b = (\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ that Σ_m, Σ_n satisfy all the conditions in (2.5), (2.10).

3. Verification that $\{B_b\}$ is quasi-regular with both deviated and non-deviated members

Theorem 3.1. *We still assume (2.1), also assume the* $\Sigma_{m(t)}$ *satisfy (2.5) and (2.10). Then the resulting* $\{B_b\}$ *is a family of quasi-regular deformations that has both non-deviated and deviated members. So by theorem (***1.6***), this contradicts the assumption (2.1).*

Proof. The main thing we need to prove here is that all the indices i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2, n_0 for the quasi-regular deformations B_b are independent choice of b. We'll prove that by showing that they are numbers of zeros of sections of some vector bundles. Hence they do not depend on $\mathcal{S}_i$. The proof of the existence of deviated members will be postponed to the end of this paper.

The proof is rather straightforward. We need to write down the ideal in the local ring $\mathcal{O}_t(B_b)$ of B_b at each point $t \in c_0$. We should start from the beginning of the construction: the subvariety $\Sigma_{n(t)}$ of dimension 3. The $\Sigma_{n(t)}$ is smooth because $n(t)$ is not degenerated relative to all $\gamma \in l$. Thus we let γ, x_1, x_2 be local parameters for $\Sigma_{n(t)}$,

$$\Sigma_{n(t)} = l(\gamma) + \sum_{i_1+i_2\geq 1} \alpha_{i_1 i_2} x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\alpha_{i_1 i_2}$ are vectors in the affine space U, $l(\gamma)$ is the axis l parametrized by γ and $\gamma = 0$ corresponds to the point $\gamma_0 = (f_0, c_0)$. Then γ, x_1, x_2, t are the coordinates for

$$e(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1).$$

Note all $\alpha_{i_1 i_2}$ depend on γ. Let t be a generic point of $\mathbb{C}P^1$. We'll fix an affine open set for $\mathbb{C}P^1$ also. The varieties X, H, K, S can be viewed locally as divisors in $L \times \mathbb{C}P^4$. To abuse the notations we'll use the same letters to denote the polynomials that define them, i.e. $\{X = 0\} = X$, etc. Also to simplify the expression, we'll use the same letter X, K, H, S to express the pull back polynomials $e^*(X), e^*(K), e^*(H), e^*(S)$ of X, K, H, S.

The intersection

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X)$$

is the determined by the equation

$$X(\gamma, x_1, x_2, t) = F(\gamma, x_1, x_2, t) P_{n(t)} \tag{3.3}$$

where $P_{n(t)}$ is just a constant polynomial in t of the degree $5d-k-4$ that corresponds to the point $n(t) \in sym^{5d-k-4}(\mathbb{C}P^1)$. We can solve F for x_1 (or x_2) to obtain

$$x_1 = k_1 x_2 + \sum_i k_i x_2^i, \tag{3.4}$$

where $k_1 = -\frac{F_{\alpha_{01}}}{F_{\alpha_{10}}}$. Thus

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X)$$

is the set

$$(l(\gamma) + x_2(k_1\alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01}) + \sum_{i_1+i_2\geq 2} \alpha_{i_1 i_2} x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2}, t) \tag{3.5}$$

parametrized by γ, x_2, t. Note $k_1(t, \gamma)$ is a function of t, γ, and $x_1(t, x_2, \gamma)$ is a function of γ, x_2, t. Next we analyze the intersection in (2.8),

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H),$$

in a great detail to interpret the meaning of (2.8), in terms of vanishing orders of polynomials in local coordinates. The other intersections in (2.5) and (2.10) are similar to this intersection. Thus we'll analyze it by referring to the same process for (2.8). This process of analyzing will lead to the defining equations of B_b which will show that all the numbers $i_1, j_1, i_2, \cdots$ in the definition (**1.2**) are independent of b. Denote the vector $k_1\alpha_{10}+\alpha_{01}$ by v_t. Plug the (3.5) into the defining equations of $e^{-1}(S)$. Then

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S)$$

is defined by

$$x_2\bigg(S_{v_t}|_{\gamma_0} + \gamma(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma_0} + x_2 b_1 + \gamma^2 b_2\bigg) = 0 \tag{3.6}$$

where b_i are non-zero at $\gamma = 0$ and t. Thus

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0$$

is defined by

$$S_{v_t}|_{\gamma_0} + \gamma(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma_0} + x_2 b_1 + \gamma^2 b_2 = 0. \tag{3.7}$$

By the condition (2.8),

$$S_{v_t}|_{\gamma_0} = 0 \tag{3.8}$$

for all t and

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma_0}$$

is not zero at generic t. This is because that

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H)$$

then is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}&\gamma(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma_0} + \gamma^2 b_2 = 0,\\ &x_2 = 0,\\ &x_1 = 0.\end{aligned}$$

(So at generic point of $\bar{\gamma}_0$, it is defined by

$$\gamma = x_1 = x_2 = 0.)$$

Similarly,

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(H)$$

is defined by

$$x_2\left(H_{v_t}|_{\gamma_0} + \gamma(H_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma_0} + x_2\tilde{b}_1 + \gamma^2\tilde{b}_2\right) = 0 \tag{3.9}$$

By (2.7), $H_{v(t)} \neq 0$ for all t.

For the last equation (2.9), we note by the definition of $\Sigma_{m(t)}$,

$$(\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap \{F|_{t=0} = 0\} = \Sigma_m \tag{3.10}$$

Let $(q(x_1, x_2) + b_4(x_1, x_2)\gamma + b_5)$ be the second and higher order expansion of

$$F|_{t=0} = F(\gamma, x_1, x_2, 0).$$

So $q(k_1, 1)$ is

$$k_1^2\frac{1}{2}F_{x_1x_1} + k_1F_{x_1x_2} + \frac{1}{2}F_{x_2x_2},$$

evaluated at $x_1 = k_1, x_2 = 1$. Then we can use the same arguments as above to obtain that

$$((\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X))_0$$

is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &x_1 = k_1x_2 + \sum_{i\geq 2} k_ix_2^i, \\ &k_1b_3(\gamma)\gamma^2 + x_2(q(k_1, 1) + b_4\gamma + b_5x_2) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where b_i does not vanish at $x_2 = \gamma = 0$ and there is no linear term in γ because of (2.9).

Now we can write down the equations for B_b. Let $\bar{B}_b$ be the subvariety of Σ_n which is defined by equations

$$\begin{aligned} &x_1 = k_1x_2 + \sum_{i\geq 2} k_ix_2^i, \\ &k_1b_3(\gamma)\gamma^2 + x_2(q(k_1) + b_4\gamma + b_5x_2) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

Then B_b is just the image of $\bar{B}_b$ under the map e. Introduce the coordinates $(t, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2)$ for X such that $\{\theta_2 = 0\}$ is S, $\{\theta_1 = 0\}$ is H, $\{\theta_0 = 0\}$ is K and $\theta_0 = \theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$ is the c_0. Let those local coordinates also include that at point p_i from **Definition 1.3**, part (3), i.e. the tangent space of $\{\theta_2 = 0\}$ determines E at this point, but $\{\theta_2 = 0\}$ is not S. Next we convert the parametric expression (3.12)

(That was how we define B_b above) to an expression in defining equations. At the points $t \in \mathbb{C}P^1$ with $q(k_1, 1) \neq 0$, we have $x_2 = -\frac{k_1 b_6}{q(k_1,1)}\gamma^2$ where b_6 does not vanish at $\gamma = 0, t$. Without loosing generality, we might assume the image of the divisor $\{\gamma = 0\}$ under e is just the divisor K. Thus plug the coordinates expression (3.12) into K, H, S and use $x_2 = -\frac{k_1 b_6}{q(k_1,1)}\gamma^2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\gamma = \theta_0 \\ &k_1\gamma^2 H_{v_t} b_7(\gamma) + \gamma^3 b_8(\gamma, t) = \theta_1 \\ &k_1\gamma^3 (S_{v_t})_\gamma b_9(\gamma) + \gamma^4 b_{10}(\gamma, t) = \theta_2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

Replacing γ by θ_0, we obtain the local defining equations of B_b:

$$\begin{aligned} &k_1\theta_0^2 H_{v_t} b_7(\theta_0) + \theta_0^3 b_8(\theta_0, t) = \theta_1 \\ &k_1\theta_0^3 (S_{v_t})_\gamma b_9(\theta_0) + \theta_0^4 b_{10}(\theta_0, t) = \theta_2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

Because the coefficients for θ_1, θ_2 are always 1, B_b is always smooth at these points. The equations LOCALLY define B_b at points where $q(k_1, 1) \neq 0$. The coefficients of the leading terms in (3.14) are global in the sense that they are for all points of c_0.

Those indices $i, j, \cdots$ correspond to the numbers of zeros of $k_1 = 0$, $H_{v_t} = 0$ and $(S_{v_t})_\gamma = 0$ evaluated at $\bar{\gamma}_0$. Next we just need to find the numbers of all these zeros. First in equations (3.14), there are two different kinds of poles: one, from the zeros of $F_{\alpha_{10}}(\gamma_0, t) = 0$ in an expression for k_1 (below (3.4)), is not an singular point of B_b(because we can always solve for x_2 in the step of (3.4) then those poles are not the poles in the expression for x_2); the others are just from the set of all zeros of $q(k_1, 1) = 0$ which are singular points of B_b. In the following calculation, all the derivatives on the vector fields, as we noted at the beginning of section **3**, use the flat connection on the affine set

$$U \times \mathbb{C}^1.$$

Then furthermore we can calculate

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma_0} = S_{(v_t)_\gamma} + S_{v_t\gamma}$$

Note

$$S_{v_t}|_{\gamma_0} = 0.$$

Thus $e_*(v_t|_{\gamma_0})$ lies in E. By the lemma (**4.3**), there is a vector v_t^γ such that

$$S_{v_t\gamma} = -S_{v_t^\gamma}. \tag{3.15}$$

Thus

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma=0} = S_{(v_t)_\gamma - v_t^\gamma} \tag{3.16}$$

To understand how many zeros there are (or how many imbedded points there are for the intersections in (2.5)), we need to know the zeros of the (3.16) in t. First we denote this vector

$$(v_t)_\gamma - v_t^\gamma = (k_1\alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01})_\gamma - v_t^\gamma$$

by β_1^γ. It has $k+3$ poles on $\gamma_0 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$ (first kind of poles, so they are not singular points of B_b), this is because of the following: by the definition of $m(t), n(t)$,

$$F_{\alpha_{01}}, F_{\alpha_{10}}$$

both are polynomials in t of degree $k+4$ at general γ, and also both are divisible by t at γ_0. Furthermore, by (2.9),

$$(F_{\alpha_{01}}(0,0))_\gamma = (F_{\alpha_{10}}(0,0))_\gamma = 0.$$

So

$$(k_1)_\gamma = (\frac{F_{\alpha_{01}}(0,t)}{F_{\alpha_{10}}(0,t)})_\gamma$$

has only $k+3$ poles (pole at 0 is canceled).

Note k_1 at γ_0 has the same $k+3$ poles which are the non-zero zeros of

$$F_{\alpha_{10}}(0,t) = 0.$$

Let $h(t)$ be the polynomials such that $div(h(t))$ is the sum of these $k+3$ poles. For the simplicity we would like to multiply

$$(v_t)_\gamma - v_t^\gamma$$

by the degree $k+3$ polynomial $h(t)$ to get rid of the poles to have a section of

$$T_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}P^1}(U \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \otimes \mathcal{O}(k+3)$$

Let's denote this section by $\bar{\beta}_1^\gamma$. Clearly, to get rid of the poles of k_1, we can multiply the same polynomial $h(t)$ of degree $k+3$. To summarize it, we have

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma|_{\gamma=0} = S_{\beta_1^\gamma}.$$

Note that $\bar{\beta_1^\gamma} = \beta_1^\gamma h(t)$ is a section of

$$T_{\{0\}\times\mathbb{C}P^1}(U \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \otimes \mathcal{O}(k+3).$$

So a root of $S_{\beta_1^\gamma} = 0$ is a point where $e_*(\bar{\beta_1^\gamma})$ lies in E. Note $e_*(\bar{\beta_1^\gamma})$ is reduced to a holomorphic section in

$$TX/E|_{\bar{c}_0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(k+3) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(1)$$

Thus

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma = S_{\beta_1^\gamma} = 0$$

has one root. By (2.10) this only root of

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma = 0$$

is a singular point of B_b of $m = 1$.

Similarly note

$$E/TC|_{\bar{c}_0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(k+3) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(2k+3).$$

A root of $H_{v_t} = 0$ is just a point where $e_*(v_t)$ lies in TC. Similarly by multiplying the polynomial $h(t)$, $e_*(v_t \cdot h(t))$ induces a section in

$$E/TC|_{\bar{c}_0} \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(k+3) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(2k+3).$$

Since $e_*(v_t)$ lies in TC at $2k+3$ points,

$$H_{v_t} = 0$$

has $2k+3$ roots.

Now recall in (2.3), we have indices i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 for such a quasi regular deformation B_b.

In this case by (3.14),

$$i_1 = j_1 = k+3. \tag{3.17}$$

is the number of roots of $k_1 = 0$. The i_2 is the number of roots of

$$(S_{v_t})_\gamma = 0$$

which are smooth points of B_b. We just mentioned by (2.10), part (2), the only root of $(S_{v_t})_\gamma = 0$ is the singular point of B_b with $m = 1$. Thus

$$i_2 = 0. \tag{3.18}$$

The j_2 is the number of the roots $H_{v_t} = 0$ which are smooth points of B_b. Since by (2.14), one of root of $H_{v_t} = 0$ is a singular point of B_b of $m = 1$. So

$$j_2 = 2k + 2 \tag{3.19}$$

Next we consider the situation at the point t where $q(k_1, t) = 0$. This is a singular point of B_b. First assume this is a singularity $t = 0$ of $m = 0$, we have similar equations for B_b. The B_b is the projection, to $(t, \theta_0, \theta_1, \theta_2)$-plane, of

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta_0^2 + x_2\Big(a_1 t + a_2\theta_0 + a_3 x_2\Big) = 0, \\ &\theta_1 = x_2\big(a_4 + a_5\theta_0 + a_6 x_2\big), \\ &\theta_2 = x_2\big(a_7\theta_0 + a_8 x_2 + a_9 x_2\theta_0 + a_{10}x_2^2\big), \end{aligned} \tag{3.20}$$

where all a_i come from the expansions of

$$F(\theta_0, x_1(x_2, t), x_2, 0), H(\theta_0, x_1(x_2, t), x_2, t), S(\theta_0, x_1(x_2, t), x_2, t).$$

Specifically the set of equations (3.20) comes from the set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\delta_1(\theta_0, x_2, t)} F(\theta_0, x_1(x_2, t), x_2, 0) = \theta_0^2 + x_2\Big(a_1 t + a_2\theta_0 + a_3 x_2\Big), \\ &\frac{1}{\delta_2(\theta_0, x_2, t)} H(\theta_0, x_1(x_2, t), x_2, t) = x_2\big(a_4 + a_5\theta_0 + a_6 x_2\big), \\ &\frac{1}{\delta_3(\theta_0, x_2, t)} S(\theta_0, x_1(x_2, t), x_2, t) = x_2\big(a_7\theta_0 + a_8 x_2 + a_9 x_2\theta_0 + a_{10}x_2^2\big), \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3$ are just the coefficients of θ_0^2 in F, x_2^2 in H and $x_2\theta_2 t$ in S. Thus $a_6 = a_7 = 1$. The importance of those coefficients a_i is that they determine whether the surfaces B_b at singular point is deviated or non-deviated.

Considering the degree of the polynomial $q(k_1, 1)h^2 = 0$ is $2k + 6$. One of them has already been considered above with m-index 1. Thus we conclude the number of singular points of $m = 0$ is

$$n_0 = 2k + 5. \tag{3.21}$$

If this is the point $t = 0$ of $m = 1$ as in (2.10), which is the point p_0. We have coordinates of the mapping e as before,

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta_0^2 + x_2\Big(a_1 t + a_2\theta_0 + a_3 x_2\Big) = 0, \\ &\theta_1 = x_2\big(a_4 t + a_5\theta_0 + a_6 x_2\big), \\ &\theta_2 = x_2\big(a_7\theta_0 t + a_8 t x_2 + a_9 x_2\theta_0 + a_{10}x_2^2\big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

where all the a_i are none zero at this singular point. B_b is the subvariety in the (t, θ_i) plane defined by (3.22) with x_2 eliminated.

In the first equation, the existence of $a_1 t$ term with $a_1 \neq 0$ at the point is due to the condition (2.9a), part (1); in second equation, $a_4 t$ exists because of the condition (2.9a), part 4; in the third equation $a_7\theta_0 t + a_8 x_2 t$ exists because of the condition (2.9a), part (2), (3).

Claim 3.23. *We claim that for generic $b \in \mathcal{B}$, the B_b is non-deviated at this point; for some special b, B_b is deviated at this point(see (1.5) for the definition of deviated, non-deviated).*

The proof of this claim will be postponed to the very end of this paper.

Since there is only one point that satisfies all the conditions in (2.9a),

$$n_1 = 1. \tag{3.24}$$

Combining all (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), (3.21), (3.24), we obtain that all the indices

$$i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2, n_0, n_1$$

are constant. Therefore B_b is a family of quasi-regular deformations. By our claim (**3.23**), we completes the proof of (3.1). Note: we still need to prove (3.23) after the construction of B_b. □

Remark . Using (3.17), (3.18), (3.19), (3.21), (3.24) where all $i_1, j_1, \cdots$ are explicit, we can actually see

$$\sum_{i\neq 0} I(b, p_i) = 0.$$

By the calculation in part I, proposition (**4.1**), $I(b, p_0) = 0$ for a non-deviated B_b. Thus if B_b is non-deviated,

$$\sum_{all\ i} I(b, p_i) = 0.$$

This has no contradiction with the existence of the deformation c_f^ϵ of the rational curves in a generic quintic threefold f. To have a contradiction we need to go to special higher orders to have a deviated B_b. But the existence of such special higher orders is already determined by the configuration of the exponents in the defining equations (3.22) of B_b at p_0.

4. deformation space $\Sigma_{m(t)}$

In this section, we prove that there is such a deformation space Σ_m that satisfies all the conditions in (2.5), (2.10) and claim (3.23). The proof requires a long built-up in the geometry of rational curves in quintic threefolds. This built-up will last till theorem (**4.25**). The following (4.1)-(4.4) are basic structure lemmas and definitions at the level of tangent bundles and normal bundles. In the rest of paper, X denotes the universal quintic threefold

$$\{([f], x); x \in f\} \subset \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4.$$

Note that the old X in section (**3**) is just the restriction of the current X to the curve $L \subset \mathbb{C}P^{125}$. Also recall

$$S = \{([f], x) : x \in c, ([f], [c]) \in \Gamma_{Re}\} \subset X.$$

Without a confusion in a context, let S also denote a homogeneous polynomial on $\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4$ such that

$$\{S = 0\} \cap X$$

is the subvariety S at the generic points of S.

Lemma 4.1. *Recall*

$$N_{c_0}(f_0) = \mathcal{O}(k) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-k-2), \quad k \geq 0$$

for generic $([f_0], [c_0]) \in \Gamma_{Re}$. *Let*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \psi : T_{([f_0],[c_0])}U & \longrightarrow & H^0(T_{c_0}\mathbb{C}P^4) \\ \alpha & \longrightarrow & \alpha(t), \end{array}$$

where $\alpha(t)$ *is the push-forward of* α *by* e*(see notation (4) after assumption (2,.1)).*

(1) Let

$$\bar{c}_0 = \{[f_0]\} \times c_0 \subset X$$

where $([f_0], [c_0]) \in \Gamma_{Re}$ *is generic. So* $\bar{c}_0$ *is a rational curve in* X*. There is a unique subbundle* E *of rank* 127 *in* $T_{\bar{c}_0}X$*, such that the quotient bundle* $T_{\bar{c}_0}(X)/E$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathcal{O}(-2-k)$ *for some non negative integer* k*.*

(2) The homomorphism ψ *is surjective.*

Proof. Consider the morphism $\phi : \Gamma_{Re} \to \mathbb{C}P^{125}$ which is generically smooth. So locally around the generic point $([f_0], [c_0]) \in \Gamma_{Re}$ we have a submanifold $V \simeq \Delta^{125} \subset \Gamma_{Re}$, such that

$$\phi : V \to j(V)$$

is an isomorphism, where Δ^{125} is a disk in $\mathbb{C}^{125}$. Let

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V \times \mathbb{C}P^1 & \xrightarrow{e} & X \subset \mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4 \\ (f, c, t) & \longrightarrow & (f, c(t)) \end{array}$$

be the evaluation map. Then e is an imbedding, since c_0 is an imbedding. Thus $e(V \times \mathbb{C}P^1)$ is an submanifold in X, which is isomorphic to $\Delta^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^1$. We denote it by W. By the adjunction formula, $\int_{\bar{c}_0} c_1(T_{\bar{c}_0}(X)) = 0$. Since $\int_{\bar{c}_0} c_1(TW) = 2$, $\int_{\bar{c}_0} c_1(T_{\bar{c}_0}X/TW) = -2$. The normal bundle $N_W(X)|_{\bar{c}_0}$ over $\bar{c}_0 \simeq \mathbb{C}P^1$ is isomorphic to $\mathcal{O}(k) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-k-2)$. Since c_0 can move in f_0, so $\bar{c}_0$ can move in X and is not tangent to W. Thus k can't be negative. Hence $\mathcal{O}(k)$ gives a rise to a subbundle E in $T_{\bar{c}_0}(X)$. Therefore $T_{\bar{c}_0}(X)/E \simeq \mathcal{O}(-k-2)$.

To show E is unique, let E' be another rank 127 bundle with

$$T_{\bar{c}_0}(X)/E' \simeq \mathcal{O}(-k-2).$$

Take any vector v_t over fibre E_t of E over t, there is a holomorphic section s of E with $s_t = v_t$. The s induces a holomorphic section in

$$T_{\bar{c}_0}(X)/E' \simeq \mathcal{O}(-k-2)$$

which has to be zero section. Thus $s_t = v_t \in E'$. That shows $E \subset E'$. Since they both are of rank 127, $E = E'$.

(2) Let $[H] = O_{\mathbb{C}P^4}(1)$ be the line bundle of hyperplane section H of $\mathbb{C}P^4$ restricted to c. We have the Euler sequence over c_0,

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \longrightarrow \oplus_5 [H] \longrightarrow T_{c_0}(\mathbb{C}P^4)$$

Since $H^1(\mathbb{C}) = 0$, we exact a sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow H^0(\oplus_5[H]) \longrightarrow H^0(T_c(\mathbb{C}P^4)) \longrightarrow H^1(\mathbb{C}) = 0$$

That shows

$$dim(H^0(T_c(\mathbb{C}P^4))) = dim(H^0(\oplus_5[H])) - dim(H^0(\mathbb{C})) = 5d + 4$$

Let $\beta \in T_{[c]}\mathbb{C}^{5d+5}$, and $\tilde{\psi}$ be the homomorphism

$$T_{[c]}(\mathbb{C}^{5d+5} - \{0\}) \longrightarrow H^0(T_c\mathbb{C}P^4)$$

If $\tilde{\psi}\beta = 0$, then $(\beta^0(t), \cdots, \beta^4(t))$ is parallel to the vector $(c_0(t), \cdots, c_4(t))$, where $\beta^j(t) = \sum_i \beta^j_i t^i$ and β^j_i are the coordinates for $T_{[c]}\mathbb{C}^{5d+5}$. Hence there is a rational function $\lambda(t)$ on $\mathbb{P}^1$, such that

$$(c_0(t), \cdots, c_4(t)) = \lambda(t)(\beta^0(t), \cdots, \beta^4(t))$$

Since $(c_0(t), \cdots, c_4(t)) \neq 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{C}P^1$, $\lambda(t)$ has to be a constant. Hence $\beta_i^j = \lambda c_i^j$. Thus $ker(\tilde{\psi})$ has dimension 1. Therefore $ker(\psi)$ has dimension 0. That proves ψ is onto. $\square$

Recall that $c^*(f)$ is in $H^0_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d)$. There is a rational map $\mathcal{E}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \longrightarrow & H^0_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d) \\ (f,c) & \longrightarrow & c^*(f) \end{array}$$

Let $([f_0],[c_0]) \in \Gamma_{Re}$. The first derivative of $\mathcal{E}$ induces a homomorphism $(\mathcal{E})_*$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T_{([f_0],[c_0])}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M)/T_{([f_0],[c_0])}\Gamma & \longrightarrow & H^0_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(5d) \\ \alpha & \longrightarrow & (c^*(f))_\alpha \end{array}$$

where $T_{([f_0],[c_0])}\Gamma$ is the Zariski tangent space of Γ.

By (4.1), the vector space

$$T_{([f_0],[c_0])}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M)/T_{([f_0],[c_0])}\Gamma$$

is isomorphic to

$$H^0(T_{\{[f_0]\}\times c_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4)/E) = H^0(O_{\{[f_0]\}\times c_0}(d_1) \oplus O_{\{[f_0]\}\times c_0}(d_2)),$$

where $d_1 + d_2 = 5d - k - 2$. Let $\bar{c}_0 = \{[f_0]\} \times c_0$ as before.

Definition 4.2.

(1) The image of the isomorphism above is denoted by

$$(\lambda_\alpha(t), \mu_\alpha(t))$$

for $\alpha \in T_{\bar{c}_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M/T\Gamma)$, *where* t *is the point in* $\bar{c}_0 \backsimeq \mathbb{C}P^1$, *and* $\lambda_\alpha(t), \mu_\alpha(t)$ *are sections of* $O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_1)$ *and* $O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_2)$, *which depend on* $\gamma_0 = (f_0, c_0)$.

(2) The homomorphism $(\mathcal{E})_*$ *is denoted by*

$$(\mathcal{E})_*(\alpha) = l_1(t)\lambda_\alpha(t) + l_2(t)\mu_\alpha(t),$$

where $\lambda_\alpha(t), \mu_\alpha(t)$ *are sections of* $O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_1)$ *and* $O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_2)$ *respectively.*

(3) Similarly

$$S_\alpha|_{\gamma(t)} = l_3(t)\lambda_\alpha(t) + l_4(t)\mu_\alpha(t),$$

for generic $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$ *and some* $O_{\bar{c}_0}(*)$*-sections* l_3 *and* l_4.

Both $\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t)$ and $\mu_\alpha(\gamma, t)$ are important invariants in this paper. We'll use them in the rest of the paper. As before all the higher derivatives use the homogeneous coordinates for the projective spaces. We identify $T_{\gamma_0}U$ with the trivial subbundle $T_{\gamma_0}U \oplus \{0\}$ of the vector bundle

$$T(U \times \mathbb{C}P^1)|_{\bar{\gamma}_0},$$

where $\bar{\gamma}_0 = \{\gamma_0\} \times \mathbb{C}P^1$.

Lemma 4.3. *The notations are as in (4.1). All derivatives are evaluated at either the rational curve $\bar{\gamma}_0$ or the rational curve $\bar{c}_0$. Let $v(t)$ be a section of*

$$T_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(U) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(r),$$

such that $e_*(v(t))$ lies in E for all t. Then for any homogeneous function ψ that vanishes on S and $\tau \in T_{\gamma_0}\Gamma_{Re}$, there exists a section

$$v(t)^\tau \in T_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(U \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(r),$$

such that

$$(e^*\psi)_{v(t)\tau} + (e^*\psi)_{v(t)^\tau} = 0,$$

*as a section of $O_{\bar{c}_0}(r')$ bundle, i.e., as a polynomial in t, where the second derivative uses the affine coordinates (or flat connection) as indicated in the beginning of section (**3**). Note $v(t)^\tau$ is only unique upto a vector in*

$$T_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(\Gamma_{Re} \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(r).$$

Proof. Since $e_*(v(t))$ lies in E, by the surjection in (4.1), there exists a section

$$\nu_0(t) = \sum_i \nu_i^0 h_i \in T_{\bar{\gamma}_0}(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{O}(r).$$

such that $e_*(\nu_0(t)) = e_*(v(t))$ along $\bar{c}_0$. Then we take an extension (not unique)

$$\nu(t) = \sum_i \nu_i h_i \in T_{\bar{\gamma}}(\Gamma) \otimes \mathcal{O}(r)$$

to Γ_{Re} locally around γ_0, such that $e_*(\nu(t)) = e_*(v(t))$ at $\bar{c}_0$, where $\nu_i \in T_{\gamma_0}\Gamma_{Re}$ are vector fields of U that is defined over Γ_{Re} such that $e_*(\nu_i)$ lies in E. We can calculate

$$(e^*(\psi))_{v(t)\tau} = \psi_{e_*(v(t))e_*(\tau)} + \psi_{e_{v(t)_\tau}}$$

where $e_{v(t)_\tau}$ is the second derivative of the coordinates map e (use the homogenous coordinates of $\mathbb{C}P^4$). Note the map e is linear, thus $e_{v(t)_\tau} = 0$. Therefore

$$(e^*(\psi))_{v(t)\tau} = \psi_{e_*(v(t))e_*(\tau)}.$$

Similarly

$$(e^*(\psi))_{\nu(t)\tau} = \psi_{e_*(\nu(t))e_*(\tau)}.$$

Note $e_*(\nu(t)) = e_*(v(t))$ at $\bar{c}_0$. We obtain

$$(e^*(\psi))_{v(t)\tau} = (e^*(\psi))_{\nu(t)\tau}.$$

Notice $(e^*(\psi))_{\nu_i(t)} = 0$ on Γ_{Re}. Thus for each i,

$$\left((e^*(\psi))_{\nu_i(t)}\right)_\tau = \left(e^*(\psi)\right)_{\nu_i(t)\tau} + \left(e^*(\psi)\right)_{\nu_i(t)_\tau} = 0,$$

where $(\nu_i)_\tau$ is the derivative of the vector field ν_i in the direction τ via the flat connection. So if we let

$$v(t)^\tau = \sum_i h_i(t)(\nu_i)_\tau.$$

the lemma is proved. □

Let the universal quintic polynomial expressed as:

$$X = \beta_0 z_0^5 + \beta_1 z_0 z_1^4 + \beta_2 z_0 z_2^4 + \beta_3 z_0 z_3^4 + \beta_4 z_0 z_4^4 + \phi(a, z),$$

where $z_0, \cdots, z_4$ are the homogeneous coordinates for the space $\mathbb{C}P^4$. Let W be the sublinear variety spanned by $\beta_i, i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ in $\mathbb{C}P^{125}$. Let π be the projection from $\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M$ to W.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $0 \in \mathbb{C}P^1$ be generic. Let Ψ be the subset of Γ_{Re} such that $([f], [c]) \in \Psi$ if and only if*

$$c(0) = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0].$$

Let γ_0 be a generic point of Ψ. Then the differential map π_* from $T_{\gamma_0}\Psi$ to $T_{\pi(\gamma_0)}W$ is surjective.

Proof. Easy to see Ψ is invariant under the $GL(5)$ action with fixed $p_0 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. Thus for the generic γ_0, $G = \{g(\gamma_0) : g \in GL(5), g(p_0) = p_0\}$ is a subvariety of Ψ, so its tangent space is contained in the tangent space of Ψ. It is clear that the projection from TG to TW is surjective. Thus the projection from $T\Psi$ to TW is also surjective. □

The lemma, definition above are set-up for the following more important propositions. Recall that in the intersections of (2.5), the exponent of $\bar{\gamma}_0$ in (2.9) is larger than the exponent of $\bar{\gamma}_0$ in (2.8). This is a key requirement for the local multiplicity $I(b, p_0)$ to be a non-constant, because these exponents are exactly equal to the exponents of θ_0 in overview, (2.15)(i.e. the exponents of θ_0 of g_1, g_2 in part I, (1.5)). Due to the negative portion $\mathcal{O}(-2-k)$ in the normal bundle $N_{c_f^\epsilon}(f)$, to have these exponents in (2.8), (2.9), we must overcome this negativity $-2-k$. That requires the length r of degeneracy of $m(t)$ must be $k+3$ or larger. In general in order to have a smooth $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$, the length of degeneracy must be less than or equal to $min(d_1, d_2)$ where d_1, d_2 are defined in (4.2). Thus we must prove $min(d_1, d_2) \geq k+3$. In all the known examples to author, where there is a one parameter family of smooth rational curves in a quintic threefold, the $min(d_1, d_2) < k+3$. Thus this condition $min(d_1, d_2) \geq k+3$ is a key numerical condition that goes against the existence of a deformation of rational curves in a quintic threefold. The following two lemmas show this condition can be achieved for generic quintic threefolds.

Lemma 4.5. *With notations above, $k \leqq d-2$.*

Proof. Suppose $k > d-2$. Let $\gamma_0 = (f_0, c_0)$ be a generic point in Γ_{Re}. Let $c_0 = [c_0^0(t), \cdots, c_0^4(t)]$. We'll choose a coordinate system such that $c_i(t), c_j(t)$ for $i \neq j$ do not have common roots. Let

$$X = \beta_0 z_0 z_1 z_2 z_3 z_4 + \beta_1 z_1^2 z_2 z_3 z_4 + \cdots$$

be the universal quintic threefold. Then

$$\frac{\partial X((f_0, c_0(t)))}{\partial \beta_i} = (c_0^0)^{1-i}(c_0^1)^{1+i} c_0^2 c_0^3 c_0^4,$$

for $i = 0, 1$. Denote the vector

$$c_0^1(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_0} - c_0^0(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_1} \in T_{\gamma_0}U \otimes \mathcal{O}(d)$$

by $v(t)$. Then

$$X_{v(t)}(f_0, c_0(t)) = 0.$$

That shows $v(t)$ lies in

$$T_{\bar{c}_0}X \otimes \mathcal{O}(d). \tag{4.6}$$

Also

$$(T_{\bar{c}_0}X \otimes \mathcal{O}(d))/(E \otimes \mathcal{O}(d)) \backsimeq \mathcal{O}_{\bar{c}_0}(d-k-2).$$

Since $v(t)$ is holomorphic and $d-k-2 < 0$, $v(t)$ modulo E must be zero. Thus $v(t)$ lies in E along $\bar{c}_0$. Then $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_0}$ must lie in E at the zeros of $c_0(t)$. Similarly $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_0}$ should lie in E at all zeros of $c_i(t)$ for $i = 0, \cdots, 4$. But this is impossible unless $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_0}$ lies in $T_{\gamma_0}(\Gamma)$. By the change of the coordinates, we obtain all vectors in the form

$$\sum_{(i_0 i_1 \cdots i_4)} g_{0i_0} \cdots g_{0i_4} \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_{i_0 i_1 \cdots i_4}} \tag{4.7}$$

must lie in $T_{\gamma_0}\Gamma$, where $\beta_{i_0 i_1 \cdots i_4}$ are the coordinates in the space of quintic threefolds, and $(g_{00}, \cdots, g_{04})$ is any non-zero vector. Let V be the collection of all such vectors in (4.7). Then $V \subset T_{f_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125})$ is an open set of Veronese variety in

$$T_{f_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125}) \backsimeq \mathbb{C}^{125},$$

which span the entire tangent space $T_{f_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125})$. Thus $T_{f_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125})$ must be contained in $T_{\gamma_0}(\Gamma)$. It is obviously impossible. That completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.8. *Recall*

$$H^0(T_{\bar{c}_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4)/E) = H^0(O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_1) \oplus O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_2)).$$

Then $d_i \geq k+3$.

Proof. Suppose d_1 is smaller than d_2 and $k+3 > d_1$. Note $d_2 = 5d - k - 2 - d_1$.

First we claim all d_i must be at least equal to d. Let

$$W \subset T_{\gamma_0}(U_2)$$
$$W = \{\alpha : \alpha(t) \in \{0\} \oplus O_{\bar{c}_0}(d_2)\}.$$

The W is a sublinear space. Note that using homogeneous coordinates of $\mathbb{C}P^4$, $T_{\gamma_0}(U_2)$ is spanned by $\alpha_i \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}, i = 0, \cdots, 4$, where $\alpha_i(t)$ is identified with a section of $\mathcal{O}(d)$. They are just the basis for $T(U_2) = T(H^0(\oplus_5 \mathcal{O}(d))$. Easy to see there exists at least one i, such that $\alpha(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$ does not lie in W for a generic $\alpha(t)$ (otherwise all vectors should lie in W). Thus $e_*(\alpha(t)\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i})$ should lie in E at least at d points where $\alpha(t)$ is zero. Hence $d_1 \geq d$ (Similarly, $d_2 \geq d$). By the assumption

$$k+3 > d_1 \geq d \geq k+2.$$

That forces $d_1 = d = k+2$. Recall now

$$T_{\bar{c}_0}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4)/E = O_{\bar{c}_0}(d) \oplus O_{\bar{c}_0}(3d).$$

Then such splitting is also true when this is restricted to each quintic threefold, i.e.

$$T_{c_0}(\mathbb{C}P^4/E_{f_0}) = O_{c_0}(d) \oplus O_{c_0}(3d).$$

Next we see what kind of quintic would have such splitting. Let S_{f_0} be the restriction of S to the quintic f_0, i.e.,

$$S_{f_0} = \cup_{(f_0, c_{f_0}) \in \Gamma_{Re}}(c_{f_0}).$$

Each $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$ induces a section $T_{c_0}\mathbb{C}P^4$. So let

$$V = \{v \in span(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0,}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_4}) : v\ lies\ in\ E\ at\ one\ point\}.$$

Easy to see $dim(V) = 4$, or V is a hypersurface in

$$span(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_0,}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_4}).$$

Then all αv for $v \in V$ should lie in W. If not, $e_*(\alpha v)$ will lie in E at $d+1$ points, which contradicts the fact $d_1 = d$. Also V can not linearly span the entire space $span(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{i,}}), i = 0, \cdots, 4$, otherwise W will be the entire space $T_{[c_0]}U_2$. So V can only span V itself. Thus V is linear. Suppose V is spanned by $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_4}$. Note

$$(T_{c_0}\mathbb{C}P^4)/E_{f_0})_{c_0} = O_{c_0}(d) \oplus O_{c_0}(3d).$$

The $O_{c_0}(d)$ portion gives a rise to the sub-bundle K of $T_{c_0}(\mathbb{C}P^4)$ over c_0, of rank 2. We can always find a threefold $\{G = 0\}$ where G is a homogeneous polynomial such that $\{G = 0\}$ contains c_0 and at the generic point of c_0, the tangent space of $\{G = 0\}$ is equal to K. Since all $\alpha\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}, i \neq 0$ corresponds to the

$$O_{c_0}(3d)$$

portion, we obtain $\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_i}, i \neq 0$ is zero at c_0. On the other hand

$$z_0\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_0} + \cdots z_4\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_4} = deg(G)G.$$

So evaluated at c_0, $z_0\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_0} = 0$. Since $\frac{\partial G}{\partial z_0}$ can not be zero at c_0 (otherwise all derivatives of G will be zero), z_0 must vanish at c_0. Then $f_0 = z_0 f_1 + q$, where q is a quintic in $z_1, \cdots, z_4$ that vanish at c_0. Consider that f_0 is a generic quintic. Hence we can write the generic quintic threefold

$$X = (\sum_{i=0}^{5} m_i(a)z_i)g_1(a, z) + g_2(a, z),$$

where a are parameters for quintic threefolds, $m_i(a)$ are analytic in a, g_1 is homogeneous in z of degree 4 and g_2 is homogeneous in z of degree 5. Also for each $(a) = f \in \mathbb{C}P^{125}$, there is a rational curve c_f that lies in

$$(\sum_{i=0}^{5} m_i(a)z_i) = g_2(a, z) = 0.$$

Take any $\alpha \in T_{\gamma_0}U$. Evaluated at $\bar{c}_0 = \{f_0\} \times c_0$,

$$\left((\sum_{i=0}^{5} m_i(a) z_i) \right)_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha(t)$$

and

$$(g_2)_\alpha = l_2(t)\mu_\alpha(t),$$

where $\lambda_\alpha, \mu_\alpha$ are defined in (4.2). Actually they are sections of subbundles $O(d)$ and $O(3d)$ in above splitting. So $l_2(t)$ is a polynomial in t of degree $2d$ and $\mu_\alpha(t)$ is a polynomial in t of degree $3d$. Next we choose somewhat special α. Let a_J be the set of parameters that corresponds to the monomial

$$z_1^3 z_i z_j, i \neq 0, j \neq 0$$

Easy to see $dim(span(a_j))$ is 10. At the point $\gamma_0 = (f_0, c_0)$, we let H be the subspace of $span(\frac{\partial}{\partial a_j})$ such that for $\alpha \in H$

$$\left((\sum_{i=0}^{5} m_i(a) z_i) \right)_\alpha = \lambda_\alpha(t) = 0.$$

Note we only need five linear equations to have $\lambda_\alpha(t) = 0$, thus $dim(H) \geq 5$. Now for generic $\alpha \in H$, evaluated at c_0,

$$(g_2)_\alpha = l_2(t)\mu_\alpha(t).$$

There are two cases.

Case (1) when $\mu_\alpha(t) = 0$: Then

$$X_\alpha([f_0], c_0(t)) = z_1^3(t) p_\alpha(z_1(t), \cdots, z_4(t)) = l_2(t)\mu_\alpha(t) = 0,$$

where p is the universal quadratic polynomial in $\mathbb{C}P^3$. That shows that the rational curve c_0 lies in the quadric

$$p_\alpha(z_1, \cdots, z_4) = 0.$$

There are at least two distinct α_1, α_2 in H. Thus c_0 is lies in the intersection of two distinct quadrics

$$p_{\alpha_1}(z_1, \cdots, z_4) = 0, p_{\alpha_2}(z_1, \cdots, z_4) = 0.$$

We might assume these quadrics are irreducible. The intersection between these two quadrics must be proper. Then by Bezout's theorem, the degree of c_0 can not exceed $2 \times 2 = 4$. Because Clemens' conjecture in the case $deg(c_0) \leqq 9$ is proved, so we can exclude this case.

Case (2) when $\mu_\alpha(t) \neq 0$. Then the divisor $\{z_1(t)^3 = 0\}$ on c_0 can not be the same as the divisor $\{\mu_\alpha(t) = 0\}$(otherwise $\mu_\alpha(t) = 0$ for α in a hyperplane in H, then we go back to the first case). Then some point in the divisor $div(z_1(t))$ belongs the support of $div(l_2(t)) = 0$. But this can not be true, because all points in $div(z_1(t))$ depend on the choice of coordinate z_1 while l_2 is independent of the coordinate z_1. These contradictions prove $d_1 \geq k+3$.

□

The following proposition is designed to understand the degeneracy locus $\Omega_{m(t)}$. The part (3) of the proposition which asserts that the codimension of $\Omega_{m(t)}$ in Γ_{Re} is larger than 4 (in fact 3 is enough) directly leads to the exponent conditions in (2.5).

Proposition 4.9. *The degenerated locus I_r for $r \leqq d_i, i = 1, 2$ exists and satisfies*

(1)

$$\begin{aligned} I_r = \{(m(t), \gamma) : & m(t) = l_1(\gamma, t)\tilde{\lambda}(t) + l_2(\gamma, t)\tilde{\mu}(t), \\ & \tilde{\lambda}(t) \in H^0(\mathbb{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d_1 - r), \tilde{\mu}(t) \in H^0(\mathbb{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d_2 - r))\}. \end{aligned}$$

(2) dim(I_r)=5d-2r-k-1+dim(Γ).

(3) Let $\gamma_0 = ([f_0], [c_0]) \in \Gamma_{Re}$ be generic. Then the length r of degeneracy for $(m(t), \gamma_0)$ can be $k+3$. If $r = k+3$, there exists a codimension 4 subvariety $\mathcal{V} \subset \Gamma_{Re}$, such that $\mathcal{V}$ is smooth at γ_0 and

$$T_{\gamma_0}\mathcal{V} \supset T_{\gamma_0}\Omega_{m(t)},$$

where all tangent spaces are Zariski tangent spaces. (For this work, it suffices to have cod($\mathcal{V}$)=3. Also $\mathcal{V}$ is actually equal to $\Omega_{m(t)}$, but this assertion is not necessary for our proof.)

Proof. (1) Note the map $\alpha \to (\lambda_\alpha, \mu_\alpha)$ is surjective. By the assumption $r \leqq d_i, i = 1, 2$, for any

$$(\tilde{\lambda}(t), \tilde{\mu}(t)) \in H^0(\mathbb{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d_1 - r)) \times H^0(\mathbb{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(d_2 - r)),$$

and a generic section $h(t) \in H^0(\mathbb{O}_{\mathbb{C}P^1}(r))$, there exists an $\alpha \in T_{\gamma_0}(L \times M)$, such that

$$(\lambda_\alpha, \mu_\alpha) = (h(t)\tilde{\lambda}(t), h(t)\tilde{\mu}(t)).$$

By the definition

$$(c^* f)_\alpha = h(t)\Big(l_1(\gamma, t)\tilde{\lambda}(t) + l_2(\gamma, t)\tilde{\mu}(t)\Big).$$

So

$$div((c^*f)_\alpha) = div(h(t)) + div\Bigg(l_1(\gamma,t)\tilde{\lambda}(t) + l_2(\gamma,t)\tilde{\mu}(t)\Bigg).$$

Because $h(t)$ is generic, $\Bigg(div(l_1(\gamma,t)\tilde{\lambda}(t) + l_2(\gamma,t)\tilde{\mu}(t)), \gamma\Bigg) \in I_r$.

(2) Recall

$$I_r \subset sym^{5d-r}(\mathbb{C}P^1) \times \Gamma_{Re}.$$

Let π_1 be the projection from I_r to $sym^{5d-r}(\mathbb{C}P^1)$ and π_2 be the projection from I_r to Γ_{Re}. By part (1), π_2 is surjective and its fibre is the collection of $5d-r-k$ zeros of all polynomials

$$l_1(\gamma,t)\tilde{\lambda}(t) + l_2(\gamma,t)\tilde{\mu}(t)$$

Since $l_1(\gamma,t), l_2(\gamma,t)$ do not have a common root (otherwise the quintic threefold would be singular), the dimension of the space of polynomials

$$\{l_1(\gamma,t)\tilde{\lambda}(t) + l_2(\gamma,t)\tilde{\mu}(t)\}$$

is $5d-2r$. Thus the dimension of the fibre $\pi_2^{-1}(\gamma)$ of π_2 is $5d-2r-k-1$. Hence $\dim(I_r)$ is $5d-2r-k-1+\dim(\Gamma)$.

(3) By the (4.5) and (4.8), we may assume $d_1, d_2 \geq k+3$. Using the characterization of degeneracy locus in part (2), we can choose a degenerated

$$m(t) \in sym^{5d-(k+3)}(\mathbb{C}P^1),$$

and non-degenerated

$$n(t) = m(t) - \{0\} \in sym^{5d-(k+4)}(\mathbb{C}P^1).$$

It suffices to show that there are four vectors in $T_{\gamma_0}\Gamma$ that are linearly independent modulo $T_{\gamma_0}\Omega_{m(t)}$.

Choose a homogeneous coordinate system $[z_0, \cdots, z_4]$ of $\mathbb{C}P^4$ such that

$$c_0(0) = [1,0,0,0,0],$$

and in a neighborhood of γ_0,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial z_4}.$$

span the tangent space $T_{c(0)}\mathbb{C}P^4$ for all $(f,c) \in \Gamma_{Re}$ in this neighborhood of γ_0. Recall as before X is an equation defining the universal quintic threefold in $\mathbb{C}P^4$. For the convenience, in the following we use a special notation: $X(\gamma,t)$ denotes $X(f,(c(t))$ with $\gamma = (f,c) \in U$.

Let W be the set of all $\alpha \in T_\gamma M$, for generic $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$, such that

$$X_\alpha(\gamma, t_j) = 0, \quad for\ (t_j) = n(t),\ j = 1, \cdots, 5d - k - 4. \tag{4.12}$$

The dimension of $W/T_\gamma\Gamma$ should be 4, because $(\gamma, n(t))$ is non-degenerated. Thus W restricted to one point $c(0)$ should span the entire tangent space $T_{c(0)}\mathbb{C}P^4$, where $(f, c) = \gamma$. Therefore for each fixed i, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ we can find a vector $\alpha_i \in T_\gamma M$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} &X_{\alpha_i}(\gamma, t_j) = 0, \quad for\ (t_j) = n(t) \\ &\alpha_i|_{\gamma(0)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}, \quad for\ i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

(This holds for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$ in a neighborhood including γ_0). While α_i depends on γ, α_i at the point $\gamma(0)$ is a constant that does not vary as γ moves in Γ_{Re}. A very important observation is that: by the definition of $\Omega_{m(t)}$, if $\gamma_0 \in \Omega_{m(t)}$, the derivatives $X_\alpha(\gamma_0, 0)$ for all

$$\alpha \in T_{\gamma_0}\Sigma_{n(t)},$$

evaluated at $(\gamma_0, 0)$ are zeros. That shows that $X_{\alpha_i(\gamma)}(\gamma, 0)$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ as a function in γ lies in the ideal of $\Omega_{m(t)}$.

Using the homogeneous coordinates above, we have expression

$$X = \beta_0 z_0^5 + \beta_1 z_0^4 z_1 + \beta_2 z_0^4 z_2 + \beta_3 z_0^4 z_3 + \beta_4 z_0^4 z_4 + \phi(a, z) \tag{4.14}$$

where $\phi(\beta, z)$ is the rest of the terms in the universal quintic polynomial. Let Ψ be the subset of Γ_{Re} such that $([f], [c]) \in \Psi$ if and only if $c(0) = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. Then for $i \neq 0$

$$X_{\alpha_i(\gamma)}(\gamma, 0) = \beta_i + \phi_i(\gamma), \tag{4.15}$$

where ϕ_i are the partial derivatives with respect to z_i, thus all vanishes on Ψ. By the lemma (**4.4**), there are tangent vectors $\tau_i \in T_{\gamma_0}(\Psi)$ such that $\tau_i = (\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta_i}, \theta_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and some $\theta_i \in T_{[c_0]}M$. We have

$$\left(X_{\alpha_i(\gamma)}(\gamma, 0)\right)_{\tau_j} = \delta_i^j,$$

for $i \neq 0$, where $\delta_i^j = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $\delta_j^j = 1$.

We showed that the Jacobian matrix of $(X_{\alpha_i(\gamma_0)}(\gamma_0, 0))_{y_j}$ has the full rank 4, where y_j are the local coordinates for Γ_{Re}. Thus the subvariety $\mathcal{V}$ of Γ_{Re}, defined by

$$X_{\alpha_i(\gamma)}(\gamma, 0) = 0, i = 1, 2, 3, 4,$$

is smooth at γ_0 of codimension 4. Since the tangent space $T_{\gamma_0}\mathcal{V}$ contains the Zariski tangent space of $\Omega_{m(t)}$. We proved the part (3). $\square$

From now on, we let $(m(t), \gamma_0)$ be degenerated of length $k+3$. Thus (2.6) is satisfied.

To construct the space $\Sigma_{m(t)}$, we need to carefully write down a local coordinates for $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ at γ_0 in the following: Let

$$(\omega_{-k'-2}, \cdots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{125}, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \cdots, x_{5+k-k'})$$

be the local coordinates for $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ at γ_0, such that $x_i = 0$ define the variety (not the scheme) Γ_{Re}, $\omega_{-k'-2}, \cdots, \omega_0$ for each fixed $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{125}$ with $x_i = 0$ parametrize the k' dimensional family $(\Gamma_{Re})_{[f]}$ of rational curve in each f. So $\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_1}, \cdots, \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_{125}}$ corresponds to the first order deformation of a quintic together with a rational curve. We'll sometimes use coordinates expression (ω) for $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$. Thus $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ can be expanded in x_i:

$$\Sigma'_{n(t)} = \{\gamma + \sum x_i u_i + O(2)\}$$

in an affine open set U of $\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M$, where $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$, u_i are the coordinate's vectors for the variables x_i, and $O(2)$ are x_i-terms of with higher orders. Recall the universal quintic can be expressed as

$$X = FP_n(t),$$

where the $div(p_n(t))$ corresponds to $n(t)$. By (4.9), part (3), the first order expansion of $F(\gamma, x, 0)$ in x_i is

$$F((\omega), x, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} b_i x_i \omega_i + O(2),$$

where $b_i, i \leqq 4$ are non zero constants, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}, i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ form a basis for $W/T_{\gamma_0}\Gamma$(see 4.12), and $\omega_1 = \cdots = \omega_4 = 0$ define $\mathcal{V} \subset \Gamma_{Re}$ in (4.9), part (3). In the following arguments, we also use $F((\omega), x, t)$ to express $F(\gamma, x, t)$.

Lemma 4.17. *All notations are as above. Let $t^i((\omega))$, $i = 1, 2, 3, \cdots, k+3$ be the roots of $X_{u_2(\omega)}((\omega), t) = 0$ that don't go to the points in $m(t)$ as γ goes to γ_0, where (ω) are the coordinates for Γ_{Re}. Then there exists i, such that*

$$\frac{\partial(\lambda_{u_2((\omega))}((\omega), t^i((\omega))))}{\partial \omega_3}|_{(\omega_0)} \neq 0$$

for $(\omega_0) = \gamma_0 \in \Omega_{(m(t)}$. See (4.2) for the definition of λ_{u_2}.

Proof. The point of the proof is that assertion in the lemma will be true for a general $m(t)$(or $n(t)$), and a general $u_2((\omega))$. So at the beginning we let $u_2, \omega_2, m(t)$ be free to be determined. Thus let $J \subset T_{\Gamma_{Re}}U$ be the subvariety such that for each $(\gamma, \alpha) \in J$, $\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t), \mu_\alpha(\gamma, t)$ share $k+3$ common roots, i.e. α, viewed as a section $T_{\gamma(t)}(\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times \mathbb{C}P^4)$, lies in E at $k+3$ points on the rational curve $\gamma(t)$. Now we consider the restriction J' of J to a neighborhood of generic (γ_0, α_0) in $T_{\Gamma_{Re}}U$. In this neighborhood, let $t_i(\alpha, \gamma), i = 1, 2, \cdots, k+3$ be the roots of

$$(c^* f)_\alpha(\gamma, t) = 0,$$

for (γ, α) in this neighborhood. Notice that $t_i(\alpha, \gamma)$ is an analytic function of α and γ. If

$$\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t_i(\alpha, \gamma)) = 0, i = 1, \cdots, k+3$$

α lies in E at the points $t_i(\alpha, \gamma) = 0, i = 1, \cdots, k+3$. The converse is also true, and it is easy to see

$$\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t_i(\alpha, \gamma)) = 0, i = 1, \cdots, k+3$$

define the variety J', where (γ, α) are treated as local coordinates of $T_{\Gamma_{Re}}U$. Next we restrict the equations $\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t_i(\alpha, \gamma)) = 0$ to a subvariety. First we need choose our $n(t)$ and $m(t)$. So we consider the variety

$$K \subset sym^{5d-k-4}(\mathbb{C}P^1) \times T_{\Gamma_{Re}}U$$

where $(n(t), \gamma, \alpha) \in K$ if and only if all points $t_i, i = 1, \cdots, 5d-k-4$ in $n(t)$ are the roots of

$$(c^* f)_\alpha(\gamma, t) = 0,$$

but not roots of

$$\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t) = 0,$$

i.e. at those points, α lies in f, but not in E. Let $K_{J'}$ be the restriction of K to J', i.e.,

$$K_{J'} = K \cap (sym^{5d-k-4}(\mathbb{C}P^1) \times J').$$

$K_{J'} \subset K$ are both reduced, thus for a generic $n(t)$, the fibre

$$(K_{J'})_{n(t)} \subset K_{n(t)} \subset T_{\Gamma_{Re}}U$$

are also reduced. Note

$$\lambda_\alpha(\gamma, t_i(\alpha, \gamma)) = 0, i = 1, \cdots, k+3$$

for $(\alpha, \gamma) \in K_{n(t)}$ just give defining equations of $(K_{J'})_{n(t)}$ in the smooth $K_{n(t)}$. Actually $K_{n(t)}$ is the tangent bundle of $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$. Since $(K_{J'})_{n(t)}$ is reduced, for a generic direction $(\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_3}, \beta)$ in $T_{(\gamma_0, u_2(\gamma_0))} K_{n(t)}$ (we use the old notation u_2, ω_3 to match the original question in the lemma),

$$\left(\lambda_{u_2(\gamma_0))}(\gamma, t_i(u_2(\gamma_0), \gamma) \right)_{(\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_3}, \beta)} \neq 0$$

at the point $(\gamma_0, u_2(\gamma_0))$. Then we just pick a coordinate system for $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$,

$$\Sigma'_{n(t)} = \gamma + \sum_i x_i u_i(\gamma) + O(2)$$

and (ω) for Γ_{Re} such that

$$(\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_3}, \beta) = (\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_3}, \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \omega_3} \frac{\partial}{u_2}).$$

at the point $(\gamma_0, u_2(\gamma_0))$. Then we pick $m = (n(t), t_0)$ where t_0 is a root of $X_{u_2(\gamma_0)}((\omega_0), t) = 0$, but is not in $n(t)$ and is not one of those $k+3$ points, $t_i(u_2(\gamma_0))$. The lemma is proved. $\square$

Theorem 4.18.

There exists $\Sigma_{m(t)}$ that satisfies all the conditions in (2.5), (2.10) and the resulting B_b is deviated.

Proof. In the rest of the proof we are going to construct a central axis l and maneuver the cutting by $\mathcal{S}_i$ to meet all the conditions that are required in (2.5), (2.10). Since this is a long proof, we'll divide the proof into 3 steps.

Step (I): In this step we organize the coordinates, so the defining equations of B_b can be read more easily. Restricted to $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$, the universal quintic polynomial X can be expressed as:

$$X = FP_n(t)$$

where $P_n(t)$ is a polynomial in t degree $5d - k - 4$, whose roots are $n(t)$. Let

$$F = h(\gamma, x, t)t + F(\gamma, x, 0) \tag{4.19,}$$

where $h(\gamma, x, t)$ is a polynomial in t of degree $k+3$ and $x = 0$ defines Γ. Recall that

$$(\omega_{-k'-2}, \cdots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0, \omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{125}, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, \cdots, x_{5+k-k'})$$

are the local coordinates for $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ at γ_0, such that $x_i = 0$ define Γ_{Re},

$$\omega_{-k'-2}, \cdots, \omega_{-1}, \omega_0,$$

for each fixed $\omega_1, \cdots, \omega_{125}$ parametrize the k' parameter family of rational curves in each f. So $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ can be expressed as

$$\Sigma'_{n(t)} = \{\gamma + \sum_i x_i u_i + O(2)\} \tag{4.20}$$

in an affine open set U of $\mathbb{C}P^{125} \times M$, where $\gamma \in \Gamma_{Re}$ and u_i are the coordinate's vectors for the variable x_i. Next we need to cut $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ by $\mathcal{S}_i$. This is equivalent to finding the equations in x_i, ω_j. By (4.9), part (3), the first order expansion of $F(\gamma, x, 0)$ in x_i is

$$F(\gamma, x, 0) = \sum_{i=1}^{4} b_i x_i \omega_i + O(2). \tag{4.21}$$

Now we let l be the curve in Γ_{Re} through γ_0 and defined parametrically (with parameter ϵ) by

$$\omega_{-k'-2} = \cdots = \omega_0 = 0, \omega_1 = \epsilon^2, \omega_3 = \epsilon, \omega_2 = \omega_4 = \cdots = \omega_{125} = 0. \tag{4.22}$$

The l is a smooth curve through $\Omega_{m(t)}$ at exactly one point γ_0 where all $\omega_i = 0$. This is the cutting by $\mathcal{S}_2$. Choose a threefold $\Sigma_{n(t)}$ in $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$, that is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} &\omega_{-k'-2} = \cdots = \omega_0 = 0, \omega_1 = \epsilon^2, \omega_3 = \epsilon, \omega_2 = \omega_4 = \cdots = \omega_{125} = 0 \\ &x_3 = \cdots = x_{5+k-k'} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{4.23}$$

Thus $\Sigma_{n(t)}$ that is the cut-out by some $\mathcal{S}_i$ is exactly parametrized by ϵ, x_1, x_2, where ϵ is the parameter for the axis l.

Step II: In this step we verify the conditions in (2.5). Notice here u_1 and u_2 are just the vectors α_{10} and α_{01} in (3.2). First note, by (4.19),

$$(\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X)$$

is defined by

$$h(\epsilon, x_1, x_2, t) = F(\epsilon, x_1, x_2, 0) = 0.$$

Similarly like in (3.4), solving for x_1 in $h(\epsilon, x_1, x_2, t) = 0$, we have

$$x_1 = \bar{k}_1 x_2 + \sum_{i \geq 2} \bar{k}_i x_2^i. \tag{4.24}$$

Plugging it into $F(\epsilon, x_1, x_2, 0) = 0$ then dividing it by x_2, we obtain the

$$((\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X))_0$$

is defined by

$$\bar{k}_1 b_1 \epsilon^2 + x_2(q(\bar{k}_1, 1) + b_5\epsilon + b_6 x_2) = 0 \tag{4.25}$$

The $e^{-1}H$ is defined by $x_2 = 0$ (in the subvariety $x_1 = \bar{k}_1 x_2 + \sum_i \bar{k}_i x_2^i$.). Hence $((\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H)$ is defined at generic point of c_0 by:

$$x_1 = x_2 = 0, \epsilon^2 = 0. \tag{4.26}$$

That proves (2.9).

Note that by the lemma (**4.17**), at the point $(\gamma_0, t^i(\gamma_0))$

$$(S_{\bar{k}_1 u_1 + u_2})_{\omega_3} = \left(\lambda_{u_2}(l_3 - \frac{l_4 l_1}{l_2})\right)_{\omega_3} = (\lambda_{u_2})_{\omega_3}(l_3 - \frac{l_4 l_1}{l_2})$$

is not zero (see Definition (**4.2**) for l_i). Thus plugging (4.24) into $S(\epsilon, x_1, x_2, t) = 0$, we obtain

$$S(\epsilon, x_1, x_2, t) = x_2\left((S_{\bar{k}_1 u_1 + u_2})_{\omega_3}\epsilon + b_2(t)x_2 + b_3\epsilon x_2 + b_4 x_2^2\right), \tag{4.27}$$

where $b_2(t), b_3(t, \epsilon), b_4(t, \epsilon, x_2)$ are functions. Since $(S_{\bar{k}_1 u_1 + u_2})_{\omega_3}$ is not zero for generic t,

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H)$$

is defined by

$$x_1 = x_2 = \epsilon = 0 \tag{4.28}$$

That proves (2.8). To consider (2.7), we go back to the step before the cutting. Take a subvariety N of $\Sigma'_{n(t)}$ that is parametrized by $(\omega_0, \epsilon, x_1, x_2)$ with rest of x_i, ω_j being zero. Here ω_0 is the parameter that parametrizes one parameter family of rational curves in each quintic threefold. Then plugging (4.24) into

$$H(\omega_0, \epsilon, x_1, x_2, t),$$

we have

$$H = \omega_0 H_\tau + x_2 H_{-\frac{h_{u_2}}{h_{u_1}} u_1 + u_2} + O(2) \tag{4.29}$$

If we make a change of variable (cutting from a different angle),

$$\omega_0 = \omega_0' + a(\epsilon)x_1 + b(\epsilon)x_2 + O(2), \tag{4.30}$$

where the higher order of a, b are free and to be determined[1]. Now cut this N by $\omega_0' = 0$ to have $\Sigma_{n(t)}$. Then coefficients of (4.29) can be changed freely because a, b are free. Thus the coefficient of x_2,

$$(-ak_1 + b)H_\tau + H_{-\frac{h_{u_2}}{h_{u_1}}u_1 + u_2}$$

can't not be identically zero. That proves (2.7).

Step III: Next we consider the conditions in (2.10). Let t_0 be a root of $q(\bar{k}_1, 1) = 0$. In (4.25), the curve $q(\bar{k}_1, 1) + b_6x_2$ with $\epsilon = 0$ defines a smooth curve through the point (γ_0, t_0), which also is a component of

$$((\Sigma_m \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X))_0 \cap K'.$$

So we proved (2.10b). Next we prove (2.10a). Pick a root of $q(\bar{k}_1, 1) = 0$(one of t_0 above), and denote it by p_0. In (4.21) (that is before the cutting by $\mathcal{S}_i$), we can make a change of the variable

$$\omega_i = \omega_i' + \sum_{j=1}^{4} \xi_j^i((\omega))x_j + O(2), for\ i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \tag{4.31}$$

Then set $\omega_i' = 0$ for all i. This procedure adjusts the cutting angle by $\mathcal{S}_i$. Note that this will not change the polynomial $(S_{\bar{k}_1u_1+u_2})_{\omega_3}$, it changes the zeros of $q(\bar{k}_1, 1) = 0$. Actually the zeros of $q(\bar{k}_1, 1) = 0$ depends on the values $\xi_j^i(\gamma)$ at $\gamma = \gamma_0$ or $\omega_i = 0$ for all i, which are completely free. Thus we can make a suitable choice of $\xi_j^i(0)$ such that the root of $(S_{\bar{k}_1u_1+u_2})_{\omega_3} = 0$ is a root p_0 of $q(\bar{k}_1, 1) = 0$. The same change (4.31) could change the zeros of $b_2(t)$, where $b_2(t)$ are from (4.27). So we can also have $b_2(p_0) = 0$. Note by (4.27)

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0$$

is defined by

$$(S_{\bar{k}_1u_1+u_2})_{\omega_3}\epsilon + b_2(t)x_2 + b_3\epsilon x_2 + b_4x_2^2$$

---

[1] This change of the variable can be replaced by a change of varibale for $x_i, i > 4$ if ω_0 does not exist, i.e., if the deformation of the curve in single quintic f does not exist. So the assumption (2.1) is not necessary as long as $k \geq 0$.

Thus

$$((\Sigma_n \times \mathbb{C}P^1) \cap e^{-1}(X) \cap e^{-1}(S))_0 \cap e^{-1}(H)$$

has a component

$$(S_{\bar{k}_1 u_1 + u_2}(\epsilon, t))_{\omega_3} = 0$$

Since $(S_{\bar{k}_1 u_1 + u_2}(0, t))_{\omega_3} = 0$ has a zero at (γ_0, p_0), it defines a smooth curve (it can only have one zero) passing through this point. That proves (2.12). Similarly (2.13) is proved because $b_2(p_0) = 0$. To prove (2.14), consider

$$H = x_2\Bigg((-ak_1 + b)H_\tau + H_{-\frac{h_{u_2}}{h_{u_1}}u_1 + u_2} + O(1)\Bigg).$$

We adjust a, b such that

$$(-ak_1 + b)H_\tau + H_{-\frac{h_{u_2}}{h_{u_1}}u_1 + u_2}$$

vanishes at t_0 above. Then

$$(-ak_1 + b)H_\tau + H_{-\frac{h_{u_2}}{h_{u_1}}u_1 + u_2} + O(1) = 0$$

defines a surface that passes through $\bar{\gamma}_0$ at the point t_0. So (2.14) is proved.

At last we would like to prove the claim (3.23) about the coefficients a_i of B_b at all singular points. This about the higher order terms of coefficients $\xi^i_j((\omega))$ (higher than 0). So the following modification will not effect above choice. By a free change of the coordinates (4.30), (4.31), coefficients of second order terms

$$(g_1)_2, (g_2)_2, (g_3)_2$$

of g_1, g_2, g_3 are free. Thus $(g_i)_2, i = 1, 2, 3$ don't have a common linear factor. Thus B_b for a generic b is non-deviated.

Next we consider the existence of a deviated B_b. The conditions for a deviated B_b on a_i are that:

(1) the quadratic terms $(g_i)_2, i = 1, 2, 3$ have a common linear factor $l_0(t, \theta_0)$,

(2) one vanishing condition on the cubic terms from g_i.

Hence we write down quadratic condition, part (1) of (2.5). So we need a **non-zero** solution, (a_i, t, θ_0) of the equations

$$\begin{aligned}
g_1 &= a_4(-a_8 + a_{10}a_4)t^2 + [a'_5(-a_8 + a_{10}a_4) + a_4(-a_9 + a_{10}a'_5) + 1]\theta_0 t \\
&\quad + [a'_5(-a_9 + a_{10}a'_5)]\theta_0^2 = 0, \\
g_2 &= a_4(-a_1 + a_3a_4)t^2 + [a'_5(-a_1 + a_3a_4) + a_4(-a_2 + a_3a'_5)]\theta_0 t \\
&\quad + [a'_5(-a_2 + a_3a'_5) + 1]\theta_0^2 = 0 \\
g_3 &= (a_1 - a_3a_4)t^2 + (a_2 - a_3a'_5 - a_8 + a_{10}a_4)\theta_0 t - (a_9 - a_{10}a'_5)\theta_0^2 = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Note by the change of variables (4.31), (4.30), all the constant terms and first order terms of a_i at this point can be made free, because as we saw in (3.20), all a_i are the coefficients in the expansions of

$$F(\theta_0, x_1(x_2,t), x_2, 0), H(\theta_0, x_1(x_2,t), x_2, t), S(\theta_0, x_1(x_2,t), x_2, t).$$

Next we only consider the coefficients a_9, a_5, a_2. Let a_i^0 be the constant terms of a_i. Then the Jacobian $\frac{\partial(g_1,g_2,g_3)}{\partial(a_9,a_5,a_2)}$ at $t=\theta_0=0$ is equal to

$$\begin{vmatrix} 0 & (2a_3^0a_4^0 - a_1^0)\theta_0 t + (2a_3^0a_5^0 - a_2^0)\theta_0^2 & -\theta_0(a_4^0 t + a_5^0\theta_0) \\ -\theta_0(a_4^0 t + a_5^0\theta_0) & (2a_{10}^0a_4^0 - a_8^0)\theta_0 t + (2a_{10}^0a_5^0 - a_9^0)\theta_0^2 & 0 \\ \theta_0^2 & \theta_0(a_3^0 t - a_{10}^0\theta_0) & \theta_0 t \end{vmatrix}$$

The only term in the Jacobian that involves a_8^0 is

$$-a_8 t\theta_0^4(a_4^0 t + a_5^0\theta_0)$$

that is non-zero for a generic a_i^0 and $t \neq 0, \theta_0 \neq 0$. Thus we can always solve (4.32) so that the quadratic terms $(g_i)_2$ have exactly one common linear factor.

After (4.32) is solved, the values of $a_i, i \neq, 9, 5, 2$ remain unchanged. Thus we can find the values of $a_i(0)$ such that (4.32) is satisfied while all the a_i at other singular points are non-zero (we only need a_1, a_6, a_7, a_4, a_8 to be non-zeros).

Now consider the third order terms of g_i. Those terms involves the first order terms of a_i which contain the second orders of $\xi_j^i((\omega))$. Because the second order terms of $\xi_j^i((\omega))$ have not been used, thus they are free. Hence by the change of coordinates (4.30), (4.31), the first order terms of a_i are completely free. Thus the third order condition in (1.5), part (2)-II can be satisfied. Therefore we can set-up $b = (\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2)$ in a deviated position. The claim (3.23) is proved. We complete the proof. $\square$

REFERENCES

[Wa] B. Wang, *Clemens's conjecture: part I —An obstruction to the deformation of rational curves in general Calabi-Yau threefolds.*